



# CALIFORNIA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

## SEPTEMBER 2004 AGENDA

### SUBJECT

Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP): Proposed intervention for Cohort I, II, and III schools that failed to show significant growth

- ☒ Action
- ☒ Information
- ☐ Public Hearing

### RECOMMENDATION

1. That the State Board of Education (SBE) determine those Cohort I, II, and III schools that will be deemed state monitored,
2. That the SBE assign a School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) to all state-monitored schools and allow the local governing board to retain its legal rights, duties, and responsibilities with respect to that school, and
3. That the SBE defer a decision on those schools without a valid growth Academic Performance Index (API) that meet the alternative criteria for significant growth in order to provide districts an opportunity to file a waiver.

### SUMMARY OF PREVIOUS STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION DISCUSSION AND ACTION

At previous SBE meetings (March 2003, November 2003, January 2004 and March 2004), the SBE approved the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's (SSPI) recommendation that districts of II/USP schools in Cohorts I and II that failed to show significant growth, as defined by the SBE, contract for the services of an approved SAIT Provider. In January 2004, the SBE-approved alternative criteria for significant growth for schools without a valid growth API and approved several waiver requests on the basis of those criteria.

### SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

The 2004 schoolwide API results yield a number of II/USP Cohort I and II schools that failed to make significant growth this past year, a number of schools in II/USP Cohort III that failed to make significant growth in either of two implementation years in the II/USP program, and a number of schools in all three Cohorts without valid API growth data that are unable to demonstrate significant growth. (See Attachment 1 for the alternative significant growth criteria for Cohorts I and II schools and Attachment 2 for the alternative criteria for Cohort III schools.)

*Education Code Section 52055.5(b) directs the SBE to deem II/USP schools not*

## SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES

---

showing significant growth as state-monitored. The SSPI, with the approval of the SBE, is required to invoke sanctions from one of two groups:

1. According to the provisions of *Education Code* Section 52055.5(a), the SSPI shall:
  - Assume all the legal rights, duties, and powers of the governing board, unless the SSPI and the SBE allow the local governing board to retain these rights.
  - Reassign the principal of that school, subject to a hearing, and
  - Do one or more of the following with respect to a state-monitored school:
    - Revise attendance options
    - Allow parents to apply directly to the SBE to establish a charter school
    - Assign the management of the school to a school management organization
    - Reassign other certificated employees of the school
    - Renegotiate a new collective bargaining agreement at the expiration of the existing one
    - Reorganize the school
    - Close the school, and/or
    - Place a trustee at the school for no more than three years
2. As an alternative to the above, the SSPI, with the approval of the SBE, may require districts to contract with a SAIT in lieu of other interventions and sanctions. If the SBE approves, the governing board of the school district may retain its legal rights, duties and responsibilities with respect to that school. [*Education Code* Section 52055.51(a)]
  - SAIT teams are teams of educators with experience in curriculum and instruction aligned to state standards, SBE-adopted texts in reading/language arts and math, SBE-adopted intervention programs, use of data from academic assessments, and fiscal allocations.
  - Teams are fielded by organizations approved by the SSPI under criteria adopted by the SBE. Organizations are approved based on demonstrated evidence of turning around underperforming schools and trained on a state-designed intervention process.

SAIT teams verify information provided by the district on an Academic Program Survey, which results in a Report of Findings and Corrective Actions adopted by the local

## **SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

---

governing board. This is followed by the provision of technical assistance and support and monitoring, no less than three times a year, of the school's academic progress toward meeting specified benchmarks for improvement.

## **FISCAL ANALYSIS (AS APPROPRIATE)**

---

Details of the expenditure plan for appropriations to non-Title I and Title I state-monitored schools is incorporated in the September SBE item entitled:

“Immediate Intervention/Underperforming Schools Program (II/USP): School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT): Approval of expenditure plan to support SAIT activities and corrective actions in state-monitored schools.”

## **ATTACHMENT(S)**

---

Attachment 1: Criteria for II/USP Schools Without Valid Growth APIs to Demonstrate Academic Growth: Cohorts I and II (1 Page)

Attachment 2: Criteria for II/USP Schools Without Valid Growth APIs to Demonstrate Academic Growth: Cohort III (1 Page)

A Last Minute Memorandum will provide API Base and Growth information for the appropriate years for each school subject to being deemed state-monitored.

**Criteria for II/USP Schools Without Valid Growth APIs to Demonstrate Academic Growth:  
Cohorts I and II**

Elementary schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004 (Note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), and
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in Mathematics Standards increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004.

Middle schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students at or above the proficient level (schoolwide) on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004 (Note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), and
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards tests in the Mathematics Standards, General Math, and Algebra I increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004.

High schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004 (Note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), and
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in General Mathematics, Algebra I, and Geometry increased by at least one percentage point from 2003 to 2004.

### **Criteria for II/USP Schools Without Valid APIs to Demonstrate Academic Growth: Cohort III**

Elementary schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003 and from 2003 to 2004 (Note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), and
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in Mathematics Standards increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003 and 2003 to 2004.

Middle schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students at or above the proficient level (schoolwide) on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003 and from 2003 to 2004 (Note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), and
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards tests in the Mathematics Standards, General Mathematics, and Algebra I increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003 and 2003 to 2004.

High schools must demonstrate that:

- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in English/language arts increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003 and from 2003 to 2004 (Note: 0.99 does not equal 1.00), and
- The percentage of students (schoolwide) at or above the proficient level on the California Standards test in General Mathematics, Algebra I, and Geometry increased by at least one percentage point from 2002 to 2003 and 2003 to 2004.